IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA

STATE OF OKLAHOMA,	
Plaintiff,	
v.)	Case No. 05-cv-329-GKF(SAJ)
TYSON FOODS, INC., et al.,	
Defendants.)	

STATE OF OKLAHOMA'S RESPONSE TO "DEFENDANTS' SCHEDULING PROPOSAL PURSUANT TO JANUARY 5, 2007 ORDER"

COMES NOW Plaintiff, the State of Oklahoma, ex rel. W.A. Drew Edmondson, in his capacity as Attorney General of the State of Oklahoma, and Oklahoma Secretary of the Environment, C. Miles Tolbert, in his capacity as the Trustee for Natural Resources for the State of Oklahoma under CERCLA (the "State"), and responds to "Defendants' Scheduling Proposal Pursuant to January 5, 2007 Order (DKT. NO. 1016)" ("Defendants' Scheduling Proposal") [DKT #1016] as follows:

1. In its January 5, 2007 Order this Court directed the parties to "meet and discuss scheduling dates and submit joint dates or proposed dates by opposing parties to the Court within two weeks of the date of this Order." The State did just that. *See* DKT #1026. Defendants on the other hand, rather than simply providing the Court with their scheduling proposal, have again chosen to use a procedural filing in an effort to gain substantive advantage, filing a brief that attempts to (unjustifiably) paint the State as uncooperative and obstructionist. *See* DKT #1016. Such assertions by Defendants are not only procedurally improper, but also they are substantively unfounded. Accordingly, the State must respond.

Indeed, the parties met on two occasions and discussed their respective proposals

For example, Defendants assert that "Plaintiffs' [sic] obstinate refusal to disclose 2. such basic information [as the work product materials the State voluntarily agreed to produce on February 1, 2007, at the December 15, 2006 hearing] has severely retarded the development of the issues in this lawsuit," and that a November 2008 deadline is not achievable because the State has not "forthrightly disclosed the basis for this lawsuit in their [sic] initial disclosures or even in response to discovery." See Defendants' Scheduling Proposal, p. 2. Such assertions are without any foundation. The truth of the matter is that assertions by Defendants that they do not know the basis for this lawsuit lack credibility. Defendants were acknowledging in advertising prior to the filing of this lawsuit that poultry waste is a source of nutrients in the Illinois River Watershed. See Exhibit 1 (Sept. 10, 2004 Tulsa World ad stating: "Our Scenic River Watersheds are examples of environments that include many sources of nutrients that potentially impact the health of the rivers and streams that lie within them. We are prepared to do our part to take care of the poultry portions of the nutrient equation. .."); Exhibit 2 (Dec. 5, 2004 Tulsa World ad stating: "Lately, a good deal of concern has been raised about the effects of excess nutrients in the land and waters of Eastern Oklahoma. So where do these nutrients come from? Nutrients can come from many sources, one of which is the use of poultry litter as an organic fertilizer. . ."). Defendants were likewise put on notice of the basis of the lawsuit through the State's factrich 147-paragraph First Amended Complaint [DKT #18]. Defendants were further put on notice of the basis of the lawsuit through the State's 72-page Rule 26(a) disclosure. Defendants have also received responses by the State to some 234 requests for production and 74 interrogatories.

in good faith and, unable to reach an accord, agreed to disagree. In fact, at the conclusion of those meetings the respective sides agreed that the discussions had occurred in good faith. For Defendants now to do a 180 degree turn-around in their characterization of the meetings and suggest that the State acted in an uncooperative and obstructionist manner is a misrepresentation of the facts.

Further, to date, the State has produced more than 300 boxes of documents to Defendants, as well as a very large amount of sampling data. Rather than dealing with the lawsuit that has been plainly and in detail laid out before them. Defendants have instead resorted to repeating a tired refrain of pretending that they do not understand the basis of the State's lawsuit. Ignoring the available information cannot, however, be used as a basis for claiming one does not know what the lawsuit is all about. In short, Defendants' argument that the State's proposed scheduling order is unrealistic because Defendants allegedly do not know what the lawsuit is about lacks credibility.

3. Defendants also assert that the State has "substantially delayed Defendants in their efforts to obtain relevant records from State agencies." See Defendants' Scheduling Proposal, p. 2, fn 1. This is incorrect. See Plaintiff State of Oklahoma's Response in Opposition to "Tyson Defendants' Motion to Compel," [DKT #1036]. The truth of the matter is that the State has diligently worked to ensure that agency productions are as complete as possible and are made in a timely manner. Further, in connection with the agency productions, the State has provided Defendants with lists matching responsive documents with discovery requests, thereby facilitating the identification of relevant records. See id. To date, productions have occurred at multiple agencies, and more are in the process of being scheduled. Finally, Defendants' contention that the State has put unreasonable restrictions on the Defendants' copying is not supportable. The documents being produced by the State are in many instances working agency files. Given this fact, the State explained to Defendants that taking to a copy service all of the agency files at the same time (as opposed to on a rolling basis) would unduly interfere with the ability of the agencies to properly function. Prior to this pleading, Defendants had not raised any issue with this copying protocol. Once it was notified of this issue, the State offered to discuss

with Defendants a procedure to address their concerns. Simply put, the agency productions are proceeding at an appropriate pace and will not detract from meeting the deadlines on the State's proposed schedule.

- 4. Defendants also assert that the State's proposal to sequence the disclosure of its non-damage and damage experts is "improper." *See* Defendants' Scheduling Proposal, p. 3. Defendants, however, neglected in their papers to explain the State's reasoning for the sequential disclosure: namely that until the injury is fully characterized, the damages work cannot be completed. Further, by accelerating the disclosure of the non-damage experts -- which are by definition antecedent to discovery of the damages experts -- discovery into the non-damage experts' opinions (and any challenges to those opinions) can be dealt with earlier in the case. The alternative proposal by Defendants -- a single disclosure of all experts at a much later date -- will do nothing but unnecessarily delay the disclosure of the non-damage experts and create a log-jam of expert-related issues at the conclusion of the pre-trial phase of the case.
- 5. Defendants also assert that the 60-day time-frame between the State's disclosure of its non-damage experts and Defendants' non-damage experts is insufficient. *See* Defendants' Scheduling Proposal, p. 3. Defendants apparently ignore the fact that in the *City of Tulsa* case, the time-frame between plaintiff and defendant expert disclosures was only 30 days. *See City of Tulsa v. Tyson Foods, Inc.*, No. 01-C-900-B, N.D. Okla., Feb. 14, 2002 Scheduling Order (DKT # 53). Further, Defendants apparently ignore the fact that the State, beginning on February 1, 2007, began disclosing its sampling data. Access to this data, in conjunction with the State's previously-provided discovery, should enable Defendants' experts to work on preparing immediately.

7. Defendants also assert that with respect to its stated intention to file a motion for preliminary injunction, the State "flatly refused" to provide details "as to the basis of the motion, the nature and geographic scope of the relief to be sought and the anticipated filing date of such a motion." *See* Defendants' Scheduling Proposal, p. 4. This is incorrect. The State merely told Defendants that it was not in a position to do so at that point in time. Indeed, the State's disclosure of its intention to seek a preliminary injunction was done as a courtesy to Defendants. The State was under no obligation to even tell Defendants its plan (or, for that matter, the timing of its plan). For Defendants to attempt to spin this sign of good faith by the State into a purported example of non-cooperation illustrates the lengths to which Defendants will go to unjustifiably attempt to cast the State in a poor light.

The State's scheduling order sets forth a fair, even-handed and appropriate schedule for moving this case forward to trial. The State looks forward to explaining in detail its proposed scheduling order at the February 15, 2007 hearing.

WHEREFORE, premises considered, the State's proposed scheduling order should be entered without modification and Defendants' proposed scheduling order should be rejected in its entirety.

Respectfully submitted,

W.A. Drew Edmondson OBA # 2628 Attorney General Kelly H. Burch OBA #17067 J. Trevor Hammons OBA #20234 Robert D. Singletary OBA #19220 Assistant Attorneys General State of Oklahoma 313 N.E. 21st St. Oklahoma City, OK 73105 (405) 521-3921

/s/ M. David Riggs

M. David Riggs OBA #7583 Joseph P. Lennart OBA #5371 Richard T. Garren OBA #3253 Douglas A. Wilson OBA #13128 Sharon K. Weaver OBA #19010 Robert A. Nance OBA #6581 D. Sharon Gentry OBA #15641 Riggs, Abney, Neal, Turpen, Orbison & Lewis 502 West Sixth Street Tulsa, OK 74119 (918) 587-3161

James Randall Miller, OBA #6214 Louis Werner Bullock, OBA #1305 Miller Keffer & Bullock 222 S. Kenosha Tulsa, Ok 74120-2421 (918) 743-4460

David P. Page, OBA #6852 Bell Legal Group 222 S. Kenosha Tulsa, OK 74120 (918) 398-6800

Frederick C. Baker (admitted pro hac vice) Elizabeth C. Ward (admitted pro hac vice) Motley Rice, LLC 28 Bridgeside Boulevard Mount Pleasant, SC 29465 (843) 216-9280

William H. Narwold (admitted pro hac vice) Motley Rice, LLC 20 Church Street, 17th Floor Hartford, CT 06103 (860) 882-1676

Attorneys for the State of Oklahoma

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on this 9th day of February, 2007, the foregoing document was electronically transmitted to the following:

Jo Nan Allen - jonanallen@yahoo.com bacaviola@yahoo.com

Robert Earl Applegate - hm@holdenokla.com rapplegate@holdenokla.com

Frederick C Baker- fbaker@motleyrice.com; mcarr@motleyrice.com;

fhmorgan@motleyrice.com

Tim Keith Baker - tbakerlaw@sbcglobal.net

Sherry P Bartley - sbartley@mwsgw.com idavis@mwsgw.com

Michael R. Bond - michael.bond@kutakrock.com amy.smith@kutakrock.com

Douglas L Boyd - dboyd31244@aol.com

Vicki Bronson - vbronson@cwlaw.com lphillips@cwlaw.com

Paula M Buchwald - pbuchwald@ryanwhaley.com

Louis Werner Bullock - LBULLOCK@MKBLAW.NET

NHODGE@MKBLAW.NET;BDEJONG@MKBLAW.NET

A Michelle Campney - campneym@wwhwlaw.com steelmana@wwhwlaw.com

Michael Lee Carr - hm@holdenoklahoma.com MikeCarr@HoldenOklahoma.com

Bobby Jay Coffman - bcoffman@loganlowry.com

Lloyd E Cole, Jr - colelaw@alltel.net; gloriaeubanks@alltel.net; amy colelaw@alltel.net

Angela Diane Cotner - AngelaCotnerEsq@yahoo.com

Reuben Davis - rdavis@boonesmith.com

John Brian DesBarres - mrjbdb@msn.com JohnD@wcalaw.com

W A Drew Edmondson - fc docket@oag.state.ok.us; drew edmondson@oag.state.ok.us; suzy thrash@oag.state.ok.us.

Delmar R Ehrich - dehrich@faegre.com; etriplett@faegre.com; gsperrazza@faegre.com

John R Elrod - jelrod@cwlaw.com vmorgan@cwlaw.com

William Bernard Federman - wfederman@aol.com; aw@federmanlaw.com; ngb@federmanlaw.com

Bruce Wayne Freeman - bfreeman@cwlaw.com lclark@cwlaw.com

Ronnie Jack Freeman - jfreeman@grahamfreeman.com

Richard T Garren - rgarren@riggsabney.com dellis@riggsabney.com

Dorothy Sharon Gentry - sgentry@riggsabney.com jzielinski@riggsabney.com

Robert W George - robert.george@kutakrock.com; sue.arens@kutakrock.com; amy.smith@kutakrock.com

Tony Michael Graham - tgraham@grahamfreeman.com

James Martin Graves - jgraves@bassettlawfirm.com

Michael D Graves - mgraves@hallestill.com; jspring@hallestill.com; smurphy@hallestill.com

Jennifer Stockton Griffin - jgriffin@lathropgage.com

Carrie Griffith - griffithlawoffice@yahoo.com

John Trevor Hammons thammons@oag.state.ok.us; Trevor_Hammons@oag.state.ok.us;

Jean Burnett@oag.state.ok.us

Lee M Heath - lheath@motleyrice.com

Michael Todd Hembree - hembreelawl@aol.com traesmom mdl@yahoo.com

Theresa Noble Hill - thillcourts@rhodesokla.com mnave@rhodesokla.com

Philip D Hixon - phixon@mcdaniel-lawfirm.com

Mark D Hopson - mhopson@sidley.com joraker@sidley.com

Kelly S Hunter Burch - fc.docket@oag.state.ok.us; kelly_burch@oag.state.ok.us;

jean_burnett@oag.state.ok.us

Thomas Janer - SCMJ@sbcglobal.net; tjaner@cableone.net; lanaphillips@sbcglobal.net

Stephen L Jantzen - sjantzen@ryanwhaley.com; mantene@ryanwhaley.com;

loelke@ryanwhaley.com

Mackenzie Lea Hamilton Jessie - maci.tbakerlaw@sbcglobal.net; tbakerlaw@sbcglobal.net;

macijessie@yahoo.com

Bruce Jones - bjones@faegre.com; dybarra@faegre.com; jintermill@faegre.com; cdolan@faegre.com

Jay Thomas Jorgensen - jjorgensen@sidley.com

Krisann C. Kleibacker Lee - kklee@faegre.com mlokken@faegre.com

Derek Stewart Allan Lawrence - hm@holdenoklahoma.com;

DerekLawrence@HoldenOklahoma.com

Raymond Thomas Lay - rtl@kiralaw.com dianna@kiralaw.com

Nicole Marie Longwell - nlongwell@mcdaniel-lawfirm.com lvictor@mcdaniel-lawfirm.com

Dara D Mann - dmann@faegre.com kolmscheid@faegre.com

Teresa Brown Marks - teresa.marks@arkansasag.gov; dennis.hansen@arkansasag.gov

Linda C Martin - lmartin@dsda.com mschooling@dsda.com

Archer Scott McDaniel - smcdaniel@mcdaniel-lawfirm.com jwaller@mcdaniel-lawfirm.com

Robert Park Medearis, Jr - medearislawfirm@sbcglobal.net

James Randall Miller - rmiller@mkblaw.net; smilata@mkblaw.net; clagrone@mkblaw.net

Charles Livingston Moulton - Charles. Moulton@arkansasag.gov;

Kendra.Jones@arkansasag.gov

Robert Allen Nance rnance@riggsabney.com jzielinski@riggsabney.com

William H Narwold - bnarwold@motleyrice.com

John Stephen Neas - steve neas@yahoo.com

George W Owens - gwo@owenslawfirmpc.com ka@owenslawfirmpc.com

David Phillip Page - dpage@edbelllaw.com smilata@edbelllaw.com

Michael Andrew Pollard - mpollard@boonesmith.com kmiller@boonesmith.com

Marcus N Ratcliff - mratcliff@lswsl.com sshanks@lswsl.com

Robert Paul Redemann - rredemann@pmrlaw.net scouch@pmrlaw.net

Melvin David Riggs - driggs@riggsabney.com jsummerlin@riggsabney.com

Randall Eugene Rose - rer@owenslawfirmpc.com ka@owenslawfirmpc.com

Patrick Michael Ryan - pryan@ryanwhaley.com; jmickle@ryanwhaley.com;

amcpherson@ryanwhaley.com

Laura E Samuelson - lsamuelson@lswsl.com lsamuelson@gmail.com

Robert E Sanders - rsanders@youngwilliams.com

David Charles Senger - dsenger@pmrlaw.net; scouch@pmrlaw.net; ntorres@pmrlaw.net

Jennifer Faith Sherrill - ifs@federmanlaw.com; law@federmanlaw.com; ngb@federmanlaw.com

Robert David Singletary - fc docket@oag.state.ok.us; robert_singletary@oag.state.ok.us; iean burnett@oag.state.ok.us

Michelle B Skeens - hm@holdenokla.com mskeens@holdenokla.com

William Francis Smith - bsmith@grahamfreeman.com

Monte W Strout - strout@xtremeinet.net

Erin Walker Thompson - Erin. Thompson@kutakrock.com

Colin Hampton Tucker - chtucker@rhodesokla.com scottom@rhodesokla.com

John H Tucker - jtuckercourts@rhodesokla.com mbryce@rhodesokla.com

Kenneth Edward Wagner - kwagner@lswsl.com sshanks@lswsl.com

Elizabeth C Ward - lward@motleyrice.com

Sharon K Weaver - sweaver@riggsabney.com lpearson@riggsabney.com

Timothy K Webster - twebster@sidley.com jwedeking@sidley.com

Gary V Weeks

Terry Wayen West - terry@thewestlawfirm.com

Dale Kenyon Williams, Jr - kwilliams@hallestill.com; jspring@hallestill.com;

smurphy@hallestill.com

Edwin Stephen Williams - steve.williams@youngwilliams.com

Douglas Allen Wilson - Doug Wilson@riggsabney.com; jsummerlin@riggsabney.com

J Ron Wright - ron@wsfw-ok.com susan@wsfw-ok.com

Elizabeth Claire Xidis - cxidis@motleyrice.com

Lawrence W Zeringue - lzeringue@pmrlaw.net scouch@pmrlaw.net

and was further served upon the following by U.S. Postal Service:

Jim Bagby

RR 2, Box 1711

Westville, OK 74965

Gordon W. Clinton

Susann Clinton

23605 S Goodnight Ln

Welling, OK 74471

Eugene Dill

P O Box 46

Cookson, OK 74424

Marjorie Garman

5116 Highway 10

Tahlequah, OK 74464

James C Geiger

Address Unknown

Thomas C Green

Sidley Austin Brown & Wood LLP

1501 K St NW

Washington, DC 20005

G Craig Heffington

20144 W Sixshooter Rd

Cookson, OK 74427

Cherrie House

William House

P O Box 1097

Stilwell, OK 74960

Trust

Rt 2 Box 1160 Stilwell, OK 74960

Dorothy Gene Lamb James Lamb Route 1, Box 253 Gore, OK 74435

Jerry M Maddux

Selby Connor Maddux Janer P O Box Z Bartlesville, OK 74005-5025

Doris Mares

P O Box 46 Cookson, Ok 74424

Donna S Parker Richard E. Parker 34996 S 502 Rd Park Hill, OK 74451

C Miles Tolbert

Secretary Of The Environment State Of Oklahoma 3800 North Classen Oklahoma City, OK 73118

Robin L. Wofford

Rt 2, Box 370 Watts, OK 74964

/s/ M. David Riggs